<center>**Remarks**</center>

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested. Claim 1 has been amended to remove the extraneous comma. No new matter is added by this amendment.

A. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7 and 9 are patentable over Whitledge in view of Spyglass Prism because neither of these references teaches or suggests the creation and/or use of capture templates to harvest content from disparate content, as claimed.

Whitledge (U.S. Patent No. 6,925,595) describes a method and system for extracting and converting hypertext electronic document elements for display on user devices using data mining conversion operations. The hypertext content conversion is accomplished by creating a document object model from a hypertext document; extracting one or more hypertext elements from the document object model using data mining expressions; converting the extracted hypertext elements; and creating a second hypertext electronic document using the converted hypertext elements and a document template. Whitledge Col. 34 lines 8-37.

The Office Action cites col. 34, lines 29-35 of Whitledge for teaching the creation of capture templates to harvest content as presently recited in claims 1 and 6.[1] This passage describes the creation of the second hypertext document using the document template. Hence, it appears that the Office Action is equating Whitledge's document template to the presently claimed capture template. This conclusion is flawed.

The document templates described by Whitledge play no role in controlling any data extraction processes and, consequently, are significantly different from the capture templates recited in claims 1 and 6. The document templates described in Whitledge are used to create a hypertext electronic document using previously extracted hypertext elements. Whitledge, col. 34 ll. 29-35, Table 23. They are not used for harvesting content. Hence, claims 1 and 6 are patentable over Whitledge.

Adding the teachings of "Spyglass Prism: Concepts and Applications", fails to cure Whitledge's deficiencies. Spyglass Prisms enable enables translation of richly formatted web content, like tables, JPEG's, etc. into formats that match the relatively limited display capabilities on many mobile devices. Spyglass Prism, pp. 1-2. Spyglass Prism does not, however, teach or suggest the creation of capture templates that would harvest content from disparate content sources on multiple platforms. Indeed, the office action does not cite the reference for such purposes. Hence, combining the teachings of Spyglass Prism with those of Whitledge would not

---

[1] The Office Action also cites col. 26, lines 22-29, but no such column exists in the Whitledge reference.

yield a scheme in which capture templates are used to harvest content from disparate content sources on multiple platforms as recited in claims 1 and 6. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 1 and 6, and their respective dependent claims, are patentable over the combination of Whitledge and Spyglass Prism.

B. The remaining dependent claims are patentable over Whitledge and Spyglass Prism, even when considered in combination with Lonnroth and Arens.

i. Claims 3 and 8

Claims 3 and 8 were rejected as being unpatentable over Whitledge in view of Spyglass Prism and further in view of Lonnroth, U.S. Patent No. 6,826,597.

Lonnroth discusses a system and method for providing clients with services to retrieve data from data sources that do not necessarily support the protocol and format required by the clients. Lonnroth, Abstract. This scheme does not involve the creation and use of capture templates to harvest content from disparate content sources on multiple platforms as recited in claims 1 and 6. Instead, intermediate response XML documents are created from received HTML content, those documents are filtered by selectively removing content according to filtering rules, and an XSL styling sheet is applied to format the response document according to another set of rules associated with the style sheet. Lonnroth, Abstract. Neither the response XML document nor the XSL styling sheet described by Lonnroth can be considered a capture template created to harvest content as recited in the present claims.

Thus, adding the teachings of Lonnroth to those of Whitledge and Spyglass Prism would not alter the conclusions of patentability with respect to claims 1 and 6 set forth above. Because these independent claims would remain patentable over the combination of references it follows that dependent claims 3 and 8 would likewise be patentable over these references.

Claims 5 and 10

Claims 5 and 10 are rejected as being unpatentable over Whitledge in view of Spyglass Prism and further in view of Arens, "Intelligent Caching: Selecting, Representing, and Reusing Data in an Information Server", which discusses caching results of queries and how to use such cached results for future queries. Arens, however, does not describe the creation and use of capture templates to harvest content by extracting data under the control of the capture templates as recited in claims 1 and 6 and the Office Action does not contend otherwise. Hence, the patentability of claims 1 and 6, and by implication their respective dependent claims 5 and 10, is not affected by adding the teachings of Arens. Stated differently, these claims remain patentable

for at least the reasons set forth above.

C. Contrary to the conclusions set forth in the Office Action, claims 59 and 60 are patentable over Whitledge in view of Lee.

Claim 59 includes the feature of harvesting content and media assets based on acquisition rules stored in a repository. Whitledge does not have any provision to harvest content and media assets based on acquisition rules stored in a repository. In fact, Whitledge's conversion process gets started when the proxy server receives a request for an original electronic document from a first network device. Whitledge, Fig. 4A, Step 52. Thus, the harvesting of hypertext electronic document in Whitledge is not based on acquisition rules stored in a repository but rather on a request from a networked device.

Adding the teachings of Lee (US Publication 2001/0054031) fails to cure Whitledge's deficiencies. Lee describes a computerized system for accumulating/updating postal address information in a database by capturing text strings from mail pieces using image capture means. Lee ¶ 0002. Lee does not, however, teach or suggest harvesting content and media assets based on acquisition rules stored in a repository.

The acquisition of addresses as images from postal mail is done by an image capture device not by some acquisition rules stored in a repository. The acquisition rules discussed in Lee are to execute a SQL query at the local capture site to extract learning candidates. Lee ¶0051. Hence, combining the teachings of Lee with those of Whitledge would not yield a scheme which enables harvesting content and media assets based on acquisition rules stored in a repository as recited in claim 59. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 59 and its respective dependent claims are patentable over the combination of Whitledge and Lee.

For all of the foregoing reasons, the claims are patentable over the references cited in the Office Action. If there are any additional fees due in connection with this communication, please charge our deposit account no. 19-3140.

Respectfully submitted,
SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP

Dated: <u>November 28, 2006</u>

/Tarek N. Fahmi/
Tarek N. Fahmi
Reg. No. 41,402

P.O. Box 061080
Wacker drive Station
Sears Tower
Chicago, IL 60606-1080
(415) 882-5023